

March 13, 1967

A 1233

and Development. Not one of the departments mentioned will be charged with a deficit. Only the Post Office. It has an R and D budget of \$20 million and it is expected to get most of it back. That the postal service serves socially and economically valuable ends seems largely self-evident. That rates increases alone cannot create the added value necessary if we are to survive in this fast-moving world should be equally as self-evident.

CLEAR COMMUNICATIONS HELP TO ELIMINATE MISUNDERSTANDINGS

When Marconi, discoverer of radio, was asked "Is there a standard by which we can measure the progress of mankind?" he replied, "There is a two-fold measure—the decrease in labor, and the increase in communications, which eliminates space, and eliminates misunderstanding." To attempt to calculate to the cent, the value of postal communication and to secure each year the revenues to meet exactly the cost, is the height of human self-deception.

Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien, speaking before the National Association of Postmasters in Louisville, Kentucky on September 29, 1966, said: "Certainly the time must come when the scope and quality of service, and not extraneous factors will ultimately determine our operating revenues. We are and should be a public service. We cannot operate under the iron law of the balance sheet. What we are doing is too important. Our profits, and I firmly believe there has never been a year when the Post Office Department did not produce a real social profit, are often unseen. They are in terms, not of dollars, but in the enormous national benefit that comes from good mail communications."

The wise course would be to deal with postage rates on a permanent stabilized basis, rather than through makeshift attempts to meet unusual conditions. There will always be some adjustments needed to equalize postage rates and charges for special services, but every change should meet this test: "Will it mean better service and a better society for a greater number of Americans?"

The postal service is every bit as vital to the total functioning of this country as is the development of good roads . . . the conquest of space . . . or the dredging of harbors. Such enterprises, and I could cite hundreds more, are undertaken for social purposes, and the resultant economic welfare of our citizens is not measured on a basis of recovery of costs, but on benefits to society. We need to begin providing 21st Century mail service, not 19th Century mail service. The communications wave of the future will swamp present Post Office facilities unless we take immediate steps to greatly expand and improve them. But it is hardly likely under present limitations that the Post Office can pick up the tab for the expansion that is unavoidable.

In order to get public acceptance and Congressional support for a dynamic postal system, there must be a real selling campaign through which the American people could better realize the magnitude and unexcelled efficiency of our present postal service—and how much greater it could be with a proper understanding of its true role. Every citizen should recognize that the social and economic values generated by the Postal System are greater than the ability of the user to pay for such a service.

Says Morton S. Baratz in "The Economics of the Postal Service": "The problem is not that the public is uninformed, but that it is ill-informed. To put it less graciously, an altogether too large part of what is popularly retailed about the postal problems is half-truth at best, utterly wrong at worst." Mr. Baratz continues: "There never has been a real and effective attempt to sell the Postal Service to the public. The Postal Service as it stands in the face of all it has to over-

come is a marvel of human achievement and the acme of efficient cooperation for a noble purpose. From pioneer beginnings to the present day, this continuing American institution has made a greater service contribution than any other."

Just as reaching the moon is a challenge that has excited the public's mind and spirit, so must we be excited about the establishment of new horizons for the postal system. Just as the Apollo program is already looking with confidence to developing the capability of voyaging to the limits of outer space, so must we look to daring concepts for the Post Office.

It will take money, but money is the least of it. The American people have always had the mind and the spirit to back their desire for improvement with all they owned. The people will back the Post Office if you will. Not Congress, not the Administration, not the Post Office Department . . . but only you and you and we the people are responsible for the kind of Post Office we have. You only get the kind of Post Office you deserve.

When someone asks you "What Is Happening To The Postal Service" tell him not snow, nor rain, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds, but only faulty national bookkeeping and the failure to ignite the national will.

Decision on Antimissile System Considered Vital to Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the current discussion in official quarters in Washington, in the Congress, and by informed citizens throughout the Nation concerning the advisability and feasibility of the United States establishing an antimissile system is considered vital because it conceivably could relate to the future of our civilization.

In this connection, the Nashville Banner a daily newspaper published in Nashville, Tenn., recently published a provocative editorial entitled, "On Antiballistic Issue, JCS Judgment Outweighs McNamara."

This editorial, I believe, is deserving of careful consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the same be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

ON ANTIBALLISTIC ISSUE, JCS JUDGMENT OUTWEIGHS McNAMARA'S

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, brought out into the open Sunday—where it belongs—the JCS disagreement with Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara on an anti-ballistic missile system as protective of American cities. The military authorities want it. The civilian secretary does not.

It has been a running argument since the Nike-X was introduced as an idea, and became an issue within the Pentagon. At that level it has been a contest between fact and theory; the fact being that on the short end of protection in any ballistic missile race, America would be in peril, and Mr. McNamara's theory being that we should cope with it instead by prevailing on the Russians to

sort of butt accounts and not engage in any more competing in this particular. Besides, he says, the cost of such a system could run from \$5 billion to \$40 billion, which he doesn't think the nation can "afford."

What the nation cannot afford is any defense gamble that could result in annihilation of ANY U.S. city or cities—the cost of which could be in the multiplied billions, and countless lives.

Secretary McNamara has not proven himself to be an expert in military evaluation, strategic and tactical decisions. These do not lend themselves to Whiz Kid manipulation at the computer keyboard. Yet he has disputed a base point of national security and defense urgently recommended as vital by men possessed of a military knowledge matching their responsibility.

If it should turn out that the Sec-Def is right in this argument (and the Joint Chiefs wrong) the taxpayers would have to pick up in the long haul an added bill estimated at \$5 billion to \$40 billion—an imprecise calculation, of considerable latitude between its two extremes.

But if the Joint Chiefs are right—and Mr. McNamara wrong—the cost of foregoing this anti-missile system could be in the hundreds of billions; with few, if any, left to pick up the pieces and put a demolished America together again. In the analysis of military need, for security and survival, the national preference is for enlightened military judgment.

By the same token, the fighting of a war—its strategic and tactical decisions; the operation for victory—are for capable military determination. The McNamara record does not shine in any particular of off-side signal calling.

A mounting crescendo of public sentiment demands swift and telling action to win the war in Vietnam; with intensified bombing of enemy territory favored, to end it in victory in the quickest time possible. That fact reflects in enlarged operations—air, sea, and land—building to a new peak of sustained assault. It accords with the instinctive desire of the men, and their command, in that field, to win it. Procrastination and indecisiveness are not of the military making.

President Johnson is right in the decision obviously reached to take off the brakes and press that drive to victory—aware finally that there is no other avenue to a genuine peace negotiation. The message thus conveyed to the enemy is that America means business; with no Nervous Nellieism concerning the impact of that message on Hanoi's partners in aggression, including Red China. It is the only way of reasonably assuring that the sacrifice to date in Vietnam will not have been in vain.

America needs the same realistic decision with regard to vital particulars of defense at home—among them the anti-missile system; long on the drawing board but shore on fulfillment while Russia has built—and is building—its own. The Soviet evidently believes it can "afford" that defense system, and is doing it.

The United States can provide whatever it takes for maximum security. The most abundantly productive land on earth can afford the investment which informed authorities deem essential. What it cannot afford is operation dilly-dally while the known enemy prepares; nor suspension of research while that enemy, with or without treaty violation, engages in unlimited nuclear and missile experiment.

What America cannot afford, further, is a programs of extravagance for non-essentials; the absurdities of which are compounded even as such key voices as Secretary McNamara's intone that we can't "afford" the Nike-X.

Embellishing the "Great Society" concept, at a growing cost of dollar-billions, isn't nearly as important as defenses to assure the

March 13, 1967

survival of any civilized society. And the snowballing global handout contains other billions that could better be used to protect America from recognized foreign threats.

The Joint Chiefs are not proposing to pass on these particulars of domestic policy. They have pointed out where the foreseeable danger is, and prescribed a common sense device for meeting it.

They are discharging an obligation in declining to knuckle under—where a security conviction is at stake in this argument within the Pentagon. General Wheeler rendered a service in clarifying the issue before the country.

Two Maryland GI's Die in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, L.Cpl. Harold T. Vaught, of Cherry Hill, and Sp4c. Russell W. Dickens, of Piney Point were recently killed in combat in Vietnam, and I wish both to commend their courage and to honor their memory by including the following newspaper articles in the RECORD:

TWO MORE MARYLAND GI'S ARE KILLED IN VIETNAM WAR

Two servicemen from Maryland were killed Tuesday in the Vietnam war, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

Lance Cpl. Harold T. Vaught, 20, a Marine Corps draftee, was killed by shrapnel from an enemy "explosive device" while on patrol in Quang Ngai province, according to the Pentagon.

His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Walter B. Vaught, of 729 Roundview road, Cherry Hill, said he had recently written that Vietnam was "nothing but fighting and killing."

LOYAL TO CORPS

The marine's mother said her son wrote her that "he'd rather be in hell."

But, Mrs. Vaught added, he was always loyal to the Marine Corps.

Corporal Vaught, a graduate of Southern High School, wrote in his last letter than "he didn't think he'd make it back," according to his mother.

Mrs. Vaught said her son was drafted and volunteered to do his two years in the Marine Corps. He expected to be discharged in July.

Besides his parents, Corporal Vaught is survived by two younger sisters, Rita, Marlene and Patricia Ann Vaught, and by his great-grandmother who lives with the family, Mrs. Ida Conway.

REENLISTED FOR VIETNAM

The other Marylander killed in action was Spec. 4 Russell W. Dickens, 23, an Army draftee who served a tour of duty in Germany and then reenlisted to go to Vietnam.

Specialist Dickens was the son of Mr. and Mrs. James Dickens, of Piney Point, St. Marys county.

The soldier's father, a waterman, said his son "liked Vietnam all right" but was bothered by the heat, which sometimes was as high as 115 degrees.

Specialist Dickens was graduated from Great Mills High School in St. Marys county. His family said he planned to be a career soldier.

He had been in Vietnam about six weeks before he was killed, according to the family.

Specialist Dickens is survived by his parents and by nine brothers and sisters.

His sisters are: Mrs. Elizabeth Barnes, of Washington; Mrs. Elaine Frederick, of Abell, St. Marys county; Mrs. Mary Alice Stewart, and Mrs. Cecilia Young, both of Leonardtown, Maryland.

Brothers surviving are: Francis, Paul, Ernest and James Dickens, Jr., all of Piney Point; and Vincent Dickens, of Norfolk.

House Says "No" to Powell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an excellent editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times of March 3, 1967, which presents an objective view of the action taken by the House of Representatives with respect to Representative-elect Adam C. Powell. This editorial follows:

HOUSE SAYS "NO" TO POWELL

The House or Representatives has voted, 307 to 116, to exclude Rep. Adam Clayton Powell (D-N.Y.). The action indicates the willingness of the House to antagonize his Harlem constituency and to face a possible impasse if he is re-elected—a situation which could have been avoided if the Congressmen had accepted the carefully considered punishment prescribed by a special investigating committee. But the House obviously did not consider loss of seniority, a \$40,000 fine and censure severe enough to match the charge of misappropriated federal funds.

The House was within its rights to vote for exclusion. Article I, Section 5, of the U.S. Constitution says, "Each house shall be the judge of the election returns and qualifications of its own members." C. Herman Pritchett, professor of political science at the University of Chicago and a noted authority on the Constitution, wrote in his book "The American Constitution," "Under this power, either house can in effect enforce additional qualifications by refusing to seat any duly elected member."

Pritchett points out that individual congressmen have been disqualified on several grounds. The House refused to seat a Utah polygamist in 1900. Victor L. Berger of Wisconsin, a Socialist, was refused his seat by the House in 1919, because of his conviction under the Espionage Act for opposing the war. Berger was re-elected by his constituents. He was again denied his seat. Before he was re-elected for a third time the Supreme Court reversed his conviction and the House then seated him. Almost a decade later, the Senate refused to seat Frank L. Smith of Illinois and William S. Vare of Pennsylvania, because of scandals in connection with their campaign funds. Pritchett says, "There would seem to be no possible judicial recourse against such legislative decisions."

The argument that Powell is being punished because he is a Negro is fallacious. Careful investigations showed Powell's behavior to have been unique in the degree of its arrogance and abuses. Nor can his brazen defiance of the courts of his own state be condoned. Powell's subsequent demonstration of unconcern about his conduct was hardly the act of a contrite man. The odds are that the House probably suffered Powell's arrogance and misdeeds as long as it did because of a reluctance to move against a Negro. Had Powell been in another branch of government, or even in private business, his punishment might

have been swifter in coming. He might have been indicted on criminal charges. Powell brought this upon himself. His race should have nothing to do with the case, although some House members may have voted against him for that reason.

Powell has said he will take his case to the courts. That is his privilege and right, as it is his right to say in his defense that he is probably not the only congressman who has violated the rules and the law. If there are others Congress should uncover and judge them, as Powell has been judged.

Silver Star Recipient From Hawaii Loses Life in Vietnam Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness in my heart that I rise to pay tribute to a brave young Hawaii soldier who has made the supreme sacrifice for his country, Army Sergeant Edward N. Kaneshiro, who last week gave up his life in Vietnam.

Sergeant Kaneshiro, the 78th Island man killed in Vietnam, was recommended last January for the highest award which a grateful Nation can bestow on its military heroes—the Medal of Honor. His intrepidity in the previous action has already been recognized by the award of the Silver Star, and I believe my colleagues will want to take special note of an article which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser on March 9, 1967, telling of Sergeant Kaneshiro's courageous exploits while under fire.

To the family of this fallen soldier, I extend heartfelt condolences over their great loss. The Nation, too, is saddened by the loss of this decorated fighting man.

The news article concerning Sergeant Edward N. Kaneshiro, Hawaii's brave combat soldier, is respectfully submitted for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HAWAII SOLDIER KILLED IN COMBAT

S/Sgt. Edward N. Kaneshiro, recommended in January for the Medal of Honor, was killed Monday in Vietnam, the Army said last night.

The Army said only that 38-year-old Kaneshiro died of gunshot wounds. No other details were available. He was the 78th Island man killed in Vietnam.

Sgt. Kaneshiro leaves a wife, four small children and his mother, all living on Oahu.

He was a member of C Company, 1st Battalion, 9th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division (Air mobile). He had been in the Army eight years.

Sgt. Kaneshiro was home on rest and recuperation leave in December, but told his family nothing about the action of Dec. 1 for which he received the Silver Star and was recommended for the Medal of Honor.

He escaped injury in that battle, which occurred at the village of Phu Nu II in the Kim River Valley in the Central Highlands of South Vietnam.

His company was on a search and destroy mission in which several Americans had been killed or wounded.

Sgt. Kaneshiro, armed with grenades and an M-16 rifle, entered a Viet Cong trench